



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/757,914

01/14/2004

Ram V. Chary

42P18595

5131

8791

7590

12/14/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

YANCHUS III, PAUL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2116

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/757,914	Applicant(s) CHARY, RAM V.	
	Examiner Paul B. Yanchus	Art Unit 2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-17, 19-22 and 24-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-17, 19-22 and 24-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final office action is in response to amendments filed on 9/19/06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al., US Patent no. 6,614,206 [Wong] in view of Van Lerberghe, US Patent no. 5,952, 814.

Claims 1, 14, 15, 20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong et al., US Patent no. 6,614,206 [Wong].

Regarding claim 1, Wong discloses a method of delivering power comprising:
using a battery charging circuit [recharging apparatus] to transfer power from a source device in a network [laptop] to a first receiving device in the network [cellular phone, column 5, lines 23-37]; and

using the battery charging circuit to transfer power from the source device to a second receiving device in the network [scanner], the first and second receiving devices being different types of devices [column 5, lines 23-37].

Wong does not disclose using an inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter for providing power from the laptop to the devices. However, as shown by Van Lerberghe, inductive coupling charge transmitters are well known in the art [column 1, lines 24-

Art Unit: 2116

35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a well known inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter in the Wong system to eliminate the need to carry to carry cables for each device to connect to the system.

Regarding claim 14, Wong further discloses using the battery charging circuit to transfer data from the source device to at least one of the receiving devices [column 6, lines 6-19].

Regarding claim 15, Wong discloses a battery charging circuit comprising:

a power delivery module [recharging apparatus. column 5, lines 23-30]; and

a charge transfer interface [universal serial bus] operatively coupled to the power delivery module, the power delivery module to transfer power from a power supply through the charge transfer interface to different types of receiving devices [cellular phone, scanner and printer, column 5, lines 23-37].

Wong does not disclose using an inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter for providing power from the laptop to the devices. However, as shown by Van Lerberghe, inductive coupling charge transmitters are well known in the art [column 1, lines 24-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a well known inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter in the Wong system to eliminate the need to carry to carry cables for each device to connect to the system.

Regarding claim 17, Wong discloses providing power from a laptop computer to a plurality of devices through a USB interface [column 5, lines 23-37].

Regarding claim 20, Wong discloses a computer system comprising:

a power supply [laptop, column 5, lines 28-30];

a power delivery module [recharging apparatus. column 5, lines 23-30]; and

a charge transfer interface [universal serial bus] operatively coupled to the power delivery module, the power delivery module to transfer power from the power supply through the charge transfer interface to different types of receiving devices [cellular phone, scanner and printer, column 5, lines 23-37].

Wong does not disclose using an inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter for providing power from the laptop to the devices. However, as shown by Van Lerberghe, inductive coupling charge transmitters are well known in the art [column 1, lines 24-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a well known inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter in the Wong system to eliminate the need to carry to carry cables for each device to connect to the system.

Regarding claim 22, Wong discloses providing power from a laptop computer to a plurality of devices through a USB interface [column 5, lines 23-37].

Regarding claim 23, Wong further discloses using the battery charging circuit to transfer data from the source device to at least one of the receiving devices [column 6, lines 6-19].

Regarding claims 26-28, Wong discloses that the power supply is a laptop [column 5, lines 28-30].

Applicant's numerous definitions of what type of power supply is used (an AC adapter, a DC power source or a fuel cell) is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in what type of power supply is used and hence are obvious variations of one another.

Claims 2-10, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al., US Patent no. 6,614,206 [Wong] and Van Lerberghe, US Patent no. 5,952, 814, in view of Matsuda et al., US Patent no. 6,774,604 [Matsuda].

Regarding claims 2, 16 and 21, Wong and Van Lerberghe, as described above, disclose a method of providing power from a laptop to a plurality of peripheral devices, but does not disclose providing power from a laptop to a PDA. Wong instead discloses providing power to the PDA through a cradle. However, as shown by Matsuda, providing power to a PDA through a USB connection is well known in the art [column 7, lines 57-61]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Wong and Van Lerberghe method to include providing power to the PDA through a USB connection with the laptop instead of through a cradle to alleviate the need to carry the cradle for charging the PDA [column 7, lines 65 – column 8, lines 2].

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Wong discloses transferring power from a laptop computer [column 5, lines 23-37].

Applicant's numerous definitions of transferring power from the computer system (transferring power from a laptop computer or transferring power from a desktop computer) is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in what type of computer system is used to transfer power and hence are obvious variations of one another.

Regarding claims 5-8, Wong and Matsuda discloses providing power from a laptop to a plurality of devices, including a cellular phone, a PDA, a digital camera, a printer and a scanner.

Applicant's numerous definitions of devices which receive power from the computer system (personal digital assistant, wireless phone, digital camera and wireless headset) is

Art Unit: 2116

construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in what type of device receives power from the computer system and hence are obvious variations of one another.

Regarding claim 9, Wong discloses providing power from a laptop computer to a plurality of devices through a USB cable [column 5, lines 23-37].

Claims 11-13, 19, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al., US Patent no. 6,614,206 [Wong], in view of Kerai et al., US Patent no. 6,531,845 [Kerai].

Regarding claims 11, 19 and 25, Wong and Van Lerberghe do not disclose determining an amount of available power in the source device, determining an amount of needed power in the receiving devices and determining an amount of power to transfer based on the available power and the needed power. Kerai discloses a method similar to the Wong and Van Lerberghe method. Kerai further discloses determining an amount of available power in a source device, determining an amount of needed power in receiving devices and determining an amount of power to transfer based on the available power and the needed power [column 4, lines 20-59]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the Kerai teachings into the Wong and Van Lerberghe method to protect the laptop from using too much battery power while powering the peripheral devices [Kerai, column 4, lines 45-50].

Regarding claims 12 and 13, Kerai discloses denying power transfer from the laptop to the handset when the laptop battery charge level falls below a threshold [column 4, lines 45-50].

Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong et al., US Patent no. 6,614,206 [Wong] and Van Lerberghe, US Patent no. 5,952, 814, in view of Matsuda et al., US Patent no. 6,774,604 [Matsuda] and Kerai et al., US Patent no. 6,531,845 [Kerai].

Regarding claim 29, Wong discloses a laptop computer comprising:

- a lid [inherent that laptop computer has a lid];
- a power supply [column 5, lines 28-30;
- a power delivery module [recharging apparatus. column 5, lines 23-30]; and
- a charge transmitter [universal serial bus], the power delivery module to transfer power from the power supply through the charge transmitter to different types of receiving devices [cellular phone, scanner and printer, column 5, lines 23-37].

Wong does not disclose using an inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter for providing power from the laptop to the devices. However, as shown by Van Lerberghe, inductive coupling charge transmitters are well known in the art [column 1, lines 24-35]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a well known inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter in the Wong system to eliminate the need to carry to carry cables for each device to connect to the system.

Wong and Van Lerberghe, as described above, disclose providing power from a laptop to a plurality of peripheral devices through a USB connection, but does disclose providing power from a laptop to a PDA. Wong instead discloses providing power to the PDA through a cradle. However, as shown by Matsuda, providing power to a PDA through a USB connection is well known in the art [column 7, lines 57-61]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2116

the art to modify the Wong and Van Lerberghe method to include providing power to the PDA through a USB connection with the laptop instead of through a cradle to alleviate the need to carry the cradle for charging the PDA [column 7, lines 65 – column 8, lines 2].

Wong, Van Lerberghe and Matsuda do not disclose determining an amount of available power in the source device, determining an amount of needed power in the receiving devices and determining an amount of power to transfer based on the available power and the needed power. Kerai discloses a method similar to the Wong and Matsuda system. Kerai further discloses determining an amount of available power in a source device, determining an amount of needed power in receiving devices and determining an amount of power to transfer based on the available power and the needed power [column 4, lines 20-59]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the Kerai teachings into the Wong, Van Lerberghe and Matsuda system to protect the laptop from using too much battery power while powering the peripheral devices [Kerai, column 4, lines 45-50].

Regarding claims 30-32, Wong discloses that the power supply is a laptop [column 5, lines 28-30].

Applicant's numerous definitions of what type of power supply is used (an AC adapter, a DC power source or a fuel cell) is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in what type of power supply is used and hence are obvious variations of one another.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul B. Yanchus whose telephone number is (571) 272-3678. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-6:00.

Art Unit: 2116

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Yanchus
December 10, 2006


JAMES K. TRUJILLO
PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2100